



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/522,822   | 08/15/2005      | Didier Fouillou      | 21.1073             | 4910             |
| 23718<br>SCHI LIMBED   | 7590 12/05/2007 | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |
| SCHLUMBERGER OILFIELD SERVICES 200 GILLINGHAM LANE MD 200-9 SUGAR LAND, TX 77478 |                 |                      | NEUDER, WILLIAM P   |                  |
|  |                 |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| SOOAK LAIVI  | , 111 // 1/0    |                      | 3672                |                  |
|  |                 |                      |                     |                  |
|  |                 |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|  |                 |                      | 12/05/2007          | PAPER            |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
|  | 10/522,822   | FOUILLOU ET AL.   |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner   | Art Unit  |  |  |  |
|  | William P. Neuder  | 3672  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply   |  |   |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).   | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS cause the application to become ABANI | TION. be timely filed  from the mailing date of this communication.  DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |
| Status   |  |   |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 October 2007</u>.</li> <li>2a) This action is FINAL.</li> <li>2b) This action is non-final.</li> </ul>   |  |   |  |  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is   |  |   |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |  |   |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |  |   |  |  |  |
| 4)  Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw  5)  Claim(s) <u>35</u> is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) <u>1-6,12-22,27-32,36 and 37</u> is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) <u>7-11,23-26,33 and 34</u> is/are objected.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or  | vn from consideration.<br>cted.<br>to.   |   |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |  |   |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the option | epted or b) objected to by drawing(s) be held in abeyance. ion is required if the drawing(s)   | . See 37 CFR 1.85(a).<br>is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).                                 |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |  |   |  |  |  |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some colonomy None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  |  |   |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date   | Paper No(s)/M  | mary (PTO-413)<br>lail Date<br>mal Patent Application   |  |  |  |

10/522,822 Art Unit: 3672

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

These claims are hard to understand because applicant failed to include the limitations of claim 7 from which claims 9 and 11 depended when rewriting the claims in independent form. Specifically no antecedent basis can be found for "the projecting parts in line 6 of claim 36 and line 5 of claim 37. Also, no antecedent basis could be found for "the sides" in line 5 of claim 36.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6, 12-19, 22, 27, 28 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Garrett 3754609.

10/522,822 Art Unit: 3672

Garrett discloses a stabilizer 26 designed to be slid onto a rod 150. At least one elastic part (see column 5, lines 56-64) is deformed when the stabilizer is held in an initial position in compression against a shoulder 150 of the stabilizer and rod. The elastic part compensates for play between the rod and stabilizer. As to claim 2, the play is in the longitudinal direction. As to claim 3, the elastic part cooperates with the shoulder to block the stabilizer in rotation with respect to the rod. As to claim 4, the elastic part is located at the end of the stabilizer and comes into contact With the shoulder. As to claim 5, other parts of the stabilizer are more rigid and non-deformable. As to claim 6, the elastic part is in the shape of a sleeve and is reversibly deformable. As to claim 12, rod 150 comprises a shoulder 152 that cooperates with the stabilizer. As to claim 13, the shoulder geometry matches the geometry of the elastic part. As to claims 14, 22 and 32, means 25 along with threads 123 hold the stabilizer in compression. Means 25 cooperate with the thread means. As to claim 15, the threads are male threads. As to claim 16, means 25 is considered a housing. As to claims 17 and 27, shoulder 152 is rigid and non-deformable. As to claim 18, the rod 150 is in a drill string. As to claim 19, the drill string is a drill stem. As to claim 28, the rod is in a string of drilling rods.

## Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number:

10/522,822 Art Unit: 3672

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 20, 21 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garrett (described above).

It would have been considered obvious to use the stabilizer in a logging while drilling tool or a measurement while drilling tool since stabilizers are commonly used in logging while drilling and measurement while drilling tools.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 35 is allowed.

Application/Control Number:

10/522,822 Art Unit: 3672

Claims 7-11, 23-26, 33 and 34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/23/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Garrett does not disclose an elastic part that is deformable compensating for play that may appear later between the stabilizer and the rod in order to fix the stabilizer in a predetermined position with respect to the rod. Firs, these limitations are functional and the device must only be capable of performing the functions. Clearly the device is capable of performing the functions. Second, column 5, lines 56-64 set forth how the device is compressed. Since the device is compressed in the same manner as applicants, it is considered inherent that the device will perform the functions even though the device only has to be capable of performing the functions. Lastly, if applicant is trying to say only the device of Garrett has no elastic part, if the part is compressed it must be elastic.

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Application/Control Number:

10/522,822 Art Unit: 3672

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William P. Neuder whose telephone number is 571-272-7032. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David J. Bagnell can be reached on 571-272-6999. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

William P Neuder Primary Examiner Art Unit 3672